

REMARKS-ARGUMENTS

Claims 16-34 are pending in the application identified above. The Examiner has rejected claims 16-34. By this Amendment, Applicants have amended claims 16, 23, 24, and 26. Applicants submit that claims 16-34 are allowable over the cited prior art and therefore, traverse the rejections of these claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of and allow claims 16-34.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Office Action (OA) mailed 18 September 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 16-34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,745,712 ("Turpin") in view of U.S. Patent 6,597,381 ("Eskridge"), in further view of U.S. Patent 6,389,434 ("Rivette"). Applicants hereby traverse these rejections.

In the present application, the cited prior art fails to teach or suggest all elements of the claims. For example, none of these references teaches "displaying simultaneously a logic view, a property view, and a form layout view" as recited in Applicants' amended claims 16 and 26, or "a display for simultaneously providing a logic view, a property view, and a form layout view" as recited in Applicants' amended claim 24. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 16-34 are allowable over the cited prior art.

Claims 16, 24, and 26

The Examiner rejected claims 16, 24, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over the combination of Turpin and Eskridge. The combination of Turpin and Eskridge, however, does not teach all of the elements of the claims. For example,

none of these references at least teaches “displaying simultaneously a logic view, a property view, and a form layout view” as recited in Applicants’ amended claims 16 and 26, or “a display for simultaneously providing a logic view, a property view, and a form layout view” as recited in Applicants’ amended claim 24.

As stated by the Examiner in the current OA, “Turpin et al. do not explicitly teach . . . **displaying simultaneously a logic view, a property view, and a layout view.**” OA, pg. 4 (highlighting in original). Accordingly, Turpin cannot explicitly teach “displaying simultaneously a logic view, a property view, and a form layout view” as recited in Applicants’ amended claims 16 and 26, or “a display for simultaneously providing a logic view, a property view, and a form layout view” as recited in Applicants’ amended claim 24. Eskridge fails to cure this deficiency.

Eskridge discloses a system and method for an automated optical inspection system. See Eskridge, col. 1:6-9. As part of the system and method disclosed in Eskridge, a graphical user interface may simultaneously show a graphical display area, a filter area, a display list area, and numerical display area. See Eskridge, col. 6:33-35. As described in Eskridge, however, the disclosed invention discusses an automated optical inspection system that can be used to detect errors in “boards.” See Eskridge, col. 9:58-60; Fig. 1, element 20. As a result, each of the areas in the graphical user interface contains information relating to the components on a board that is being or has been inspected. For example, Eskridge discloses that components on the board may be color-coded in the graphical display area. See Eskridge, col. 8:58-59. Eskridge, however, fails to disclose any embodiments in which any view contains a preview of the layout of a form. Accordingly, Eskridge fails at least to teach or suggest “displaying

simultaneously a logic view, a property view, and a form layout view” as recited in Applicants’ amended claims 16 and 26, or “a display for simultaneously providing a logic view, a property view, and a form layout view” as recited in Applicants’ amended claim 24. For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that independent claims 16, 24, and 26 are allowable over the cited prior art. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of and allow claims 16, 24, and 26.

Claims 17 - 23, 25, 27 - 34

The Examiner rejected claims 17-23, 25, and 27-34 as allegedly unpatentable over Turpin in view of Eskridge, and in further view of Rivette. None of these cited references, however, teaches all elements of Applicants’ claims. For example, as discussed above, neither Turpin nor Eskridge at least teaches “displaying simultaneously a logic view, a property view, and a form layout view” as recited in Applicants’ amended claims 16 and 26, or “a display for simultaneously providing a logic view, a property view, and a form layout view” as recited in Applicants’ amended claim 24. Rivette fails to cure this deficiency.

Rivette discloses a system and method for annotating documents and other media. See Rivette, Abstract. According to Rivette, different views may be displayed in the disclosed system, including “a note centric view, an object centric view, a link centric view, and a user-defined view.” See Rivette, col. 17:7-10. Of these views, the object view may be used to display the data object being annotated. See Rivette, col. 18:36-39. These data objects may include a patent specification, a spreadsheet, a database application, a check register, and an audio processor. See Eskridge, col. 14:9-10, col. 15:54, col. 16:7, 13-14, 20, respectively. Nowhere, however, does Rivette disclose that the object view, or any of the other views, may be used to display a preview of the

layout of a form. Accordingly, Rivette fails at least to teach or suggest “displaying simultaneously a logic view, a property view, and a form layout view” as recited in Applicants’ amended claims 16 and 26, or “a display for simultaneously providing a logic view, a property view, and a form layout view” as recited in Applicants’ amended claim 24. For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that independent claims 16, 24, and 26 are allowable over the cited prior art.

Claims 17-23 and 31-32 depend from amended claim 16; claims 25 and 33 depend from amended claim 24; and claims 27-30 and 34 depend from amended claim 26. Accordingly, these claims are allowable over the cited prior art for at least the reasons cited above for amended claims 16, 24, and 26. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of and allow these claims.

Conclusion


In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants submit that this claimed invention, as amended, is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of the prior art references cited against this application. Applicants therefore request the Examiner's reconsideration and reexamination of the application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our Deposit Account No. 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: November 13, 2006

By: 
Jeffrey Danley
Reg. No. 57,228